arXiv:1512.00997v1 [math.CO] 3 Dec 2015

The Enumeration of Cyclic MNOLS

Trent G. Marbach

School of Mathematics and Physics
University of Queensland
St Lucia 4072, Australia

Fatih Demirkale

Department of Mathematics
Yıldız Technical University
Esenler, İstanbul 34220, Turkey

Diane M. Donovan

School of Mathematics and Physics
Centre for Discrete Mathematics and Computing
University of Queensland
St Lucia 4072, Australia

Abstract

In this paper we will study collections of mutually nearly orthogonal Latin squares ($MNOLS$), which come from a modification of the orthogonal condition for mutually orthogonal Latin squares. In particular, we find the maximum μ such that there exists a set of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n for $n \leq 16$, as well as providing a full enumeration of sets and lists of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n under a variety of equivalences with $n \leq 16$. This will resolve in the negative a conjecture that proposed the maximum μ for which a set of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n exists is $\lceil n/4 \rceil + 1$.

Keywords: Latin square, MNOLS, nearly orthogonal.

1. Introduction

The study of mutually orthogonal Latin squares ($MOLS$) is a subject that has attracted much attention. Such interest has been stimulated by the relevance of the field, with applications in error correcting codes, cryptographic systems, affine planes, compiler testing, and statistics (see [8]). Although, as it is well known, there exists a set of $n-1$ $MOLS$ of order n when n is a prime or a prime power, the largest number of $MOLS$ of order n known to exist when n is

Email addresses: trent.marbach@uqconenct.edu.au (Trent G. Marbach), fatihd@yildiz.edu.tr (Fatih Demirkale), dmd@maths.uq.edu.au (Diane M. Donovan)

even is generally much smaller and such sets of $MOLS$ are hard or impossible to find; there does not exist 2 $MOLS$ of order 6, and it is unknown whether three $MOLS$ of order 10 exists or not.

Formally, a *Latin square* of order n is an $n \times n$ array in which the n distinct symbols $\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ are arranged so that each symbol occurs once in each row and once in each column. We index the rows and columns by $\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. For a Latin square L we may write $(r, c, e) \in L$ to mean that L has a cell in row r and column c that contains symbol e. We assume the 3 components of such a triple are taken mod n, so that $(r, c, e+n) = (r, c+n, e) = (r+n, c, e)$. The notation $(r, c, e) \in L$ is known as orthogonal array notation. We also write $L(r, c) = e$ when $(r, c, e) \in L$. A pair of Latin squares L_1, L_2 of order n are called *orthogonal* if the superimposition of L_1 and L_2 contains each ordered pair of symbols exactly once. A set of μ Latin squares are *mutually orthogonal* if they are pairwise orthogonal, and we refer to such a set as a *set of $MOLS$*.

Based upon the significance and usefulness that is exhibited in the study of $MOLS$, Raghavarao, Shrikhande, and Shrikhande [16] introduced a modification to the definition of orthogonality to overcome restrictions for the even order case. A pair of Latin squares L_1, L_2 of even order n are called *nearly orthogonal* if the superimposition of L_1 and L_2 contains each ordered pair of symbols (l, l') exactly once, except in the case $l = l'$, where no such pair occurs, and in the case $l \equiv l' + n/2 \pmod{n}$, where such pairs occur twice. We consider collections of μ Latin squares of order n that are pairwise nearly orthogonal, which are denoted as collections of μ $MNOLS$ of order n. Traditionally these collections are unordered sets, although we will also consider ordered lists.

An *orderly algorithm* is a way of generating all examples of some combinatorial object, such that all equivalence classes appear in the generation, but during the generation no two objects constructed are equivalent. This technique is typically attributed to [4] and [17]. A similar technique, called canonical augmentation [10], has been used to generate Latin rectangles by augmenting a row at a time (see also [7][12]). This is not the only method of enumerating Latin rectangles, and a variety of enumerative techniques have been applied to solve it (see [13] and the citations contained within). Recently, this work has lead to the enumeration of $MOLS$ [3]. In a similar vein, we will perform three orderly algorithms that generate collections of cyclic μ $MNOLS$ of order n under several equivalences. See [6] for a general reference on this kind of enumeration problem.

The pioneering work [16] on sets of μ $MNOLS$ of order n investigated an upper bound on μ when n is fixed, and they showed that if there exists a set of μ $MNOLS$ of order n, then $\mu \leq n/2 + 1$ for $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ and $\mu \leq n/2$ for $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$. In the case that a set of μ $MNOLS$ of order n obtains this bound, it is called a complete set of μ $MNOLS$ of order n.

The authors proceeded to explore the existence of sets of μ $MNOLS$ of order n by investigating μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n; that is each Latin square L has $(r, c, e) \in L$ if and only if $(r, c+1, e+1) \in L$, recalling that the entries are taken mod n. The sets of μ $MNOLS$ of order n that were found included single examples of sets of two cyclic $MNOLS$ of order 4, three cyclic $MNOLS$ of

order 6, and three cyclic $MNOLS$ of order 8, demonstrating that the bound is tight for $n = 4$. It was later shown [15] that there does not exist four $MNOLS$ of order 6, and so the bound is not tight for $n = 6$.

Further results [9] showed sets of three $MNOLS$ of order n exist for even $n \geq 358$. The authors also introduced a concept of equivalence between sets of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n called isotopic equivalence (details in Section 2). They found the number of isotopically non-equivalent sets of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n for $n \leq 12$. The number of these sets of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n is given in Table 1.

n	6	8	10	12
$\mu = 3$	1	1	≥ 1	> 1
$\mu = 4$	0	0	1	> 1
$\mu = 5$	0	0	0	0

Table 1: The number of sets of μ $MNOLS$ of order n under isotopic equivalence.

The existence of three cyclic $MNOLS$ of orders $48k+14$, $48k+22$, $48k+38$, and $48k+46$ when $k \geq 0$ was documented in [2], and also in [1], which verified that there exists a set of three $MNOLS$ of order n for all even $n \geq 6$, except perhaps when $n = 146$.

In the current paper, we find the maximum μ such that there exists a set of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n for $n \leq 16$, as well as providing a full enumeration of sets and lists of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n under a variety of equivalences with $n \leq 16$. This will resolve in the negative a conjecture of [9] that proposed the maximum μ for which a set of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n exists is $\lceil n/4 \rceil + 1$ (the maximum μ appears erroneously as $\lceil n/8 \rceil + 1$ in the original conjecture [18], and the maximum value we have written was the intended conjecture).

2. Further definitions

We will enumerate both ordered lists and sets of μ $MNOLS$ of order n. A *set of* μ $MNOLS$ of order n is a set $\{L_1, \ldots, L_\mu\}$ such that L_i, L_j are nearly orthogonal for $1 \leq i, j \leq \mu$, $i \neq j$. A *list of* μ $MNOLS$ of order n is an ordered list $(L_1, \ldots, L_\mu)$ such that L_i, L_j are nearly orthogonal for $1 \leq i, j \leq \mu$, $i \neq j$. This distinction will be important when we enumerate collections of μ $MNOLS$ of order n. A list of μ $MNOLS$ of order n $(L_1, \ldots, L_\mu)$ is *reduced* if L_1 has its first row and column in natural order.

Define an ordering $\triangleleft$ on the set of all Latin squares of order n as follows: for two Latin squares, L and M, we have $L \triangleleft M$ if and only if either $L = M$ or there is some $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $L(i, j) < M(i, j)$ and $L(i', j') = M(i', j')$ whenever either $i' < i$ or both $i' = i$ and $j' < j$. It can be proved that this is a total ordering.

Take the total order $\lhd$ on lists on μ $MNOLS$ of order n to be such that for two lists of μ $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L} = (L_1, \ldots, L_n)$ and $\mathcal{M} = (M_1, \ldots, M_n)$,

we have $\mathcal{L} \lhd \mathcal{M}$ if either $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{M}$ or there is $1 \leq \beta \leq \mu$ such that $L_\beta \lhd M_\beta$ and $L_{\beta'} = M_{\beta'}$ for $\beta' < \beta$.

Given a collection of Latin squares, $\mathcal{L}$, and $(\sigma_R, \sigma_C, \sigma_E) \in \mathcal{S}_n^3$, we define $\mathcal{L}(\sigma_R, \sigma_C, \sigma_E)$ to be the collection of Latin squares that is obtained by uniformly permuting the rows (respectively columns, symbols) of the Latin squares in $\mathcal{L}$ by σ_R (respectively σ_C, σ_E). Then each $(\sigma_R, \sigma_C, \sigma_E) \in \mathcal{S}_n^3$ is a group action, acting on the set of collections of Latin squares. Two lists of μ $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{N}$, are *list-isotopic* if there exists $(\sigma_R, \sigma_C, \sigma_E) \in \mathcal{S}_n^3$ with $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{L}(\sigma_R, \sigma_C, \sigma_E)$. Two sets of μ $MNOLS$ of order n are *isotopic* if some ordering of the Latin squares within each set gives two list-isotopic lists of μ $MNOLS$ of order n. Two lists of μ $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{N}$, are *set-isotopic* if forgetting the order on the lists gives two isotopic sets of μ $MNOLS$ of order n. Clearly the number of sets of μ $MNOLS$ of order n that are distinct up to isotopy is the same as the number of lists of μ $MNOLS$ of order n up to set-isotopy.

3. Cyclic MNOLS

We take $I = I_n \in \mathcal{S}_n$ to be the identity permutation of order n, $\tau = \tau_n \in \mathcal{S}_n$ to be the permutation that is a cyclic shift of size one, i.e. $\tau(j) \equiv j+1 \pmod{n}$ for $0 \leq j < n$, and $m_x = m_{x,n} \in \mathcal{S}_n$ to be the permutation defined as $m_x(j) = j \cdot x \pmod{n}$ for $0 \leq j < n$, where $1 \leq x < n$ and $gcd(x, n) = 1$. In the following four lemmata, we endeavor to describe properties of cyclic $MNOLS$ when they are acted upon by the group actions $(\sigma_R, \sigma_C, \sigma_E) \in \mathcal{S}_n^3$. For the following, recall that each component of a triple $(r, c, e) \in L$ is taken modulo n.

Taking a collection of μ $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L}$, if $\mathcal{L}(\sigma_R, \sigma_C, \sigma_E)$ is a collection of μ $MNOLS$ of order n then it is immediate clear that $\sigma_E(y + n/2) = \sigma_E(y) + n/2$ for all $0 \leq y \leq n/2 - 1$, in order to preserve near orthogonality. The converse is also true:

Lemma 3.1. *Consider a collection of μ $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L}$, along with $(\sigma_R, \sigma_C, \sigma_E) \in \mathcal{S}_n^3$ such that $\sigma_E(y+n/2) \equiv \sigma_E(y)+n/2 \mod n$, for all $0 \leq y < n/2$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\sigma_R, \sigma_C, \sigma_E)$ is also a collection of μ $MNOLS$ of order n.*

Proof. Take Latin squares $L_1 \neq L_2$ to be in $\mathcal{L}$ and Latin squares L_1', L_2' to be L_1 and L_2 with rows, columns, and symbols permuted by σ_R, σ_C, and σ_E. Consider the multisets $P = \{(e, e') \mid (r, c, e) \in L_1 \text{ and } (r, c, e') \in L_2 \text{ for } r, c \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}\}$ and also $P' = \{(e, e') \mid (r, c, e) \in L_1' \text{ and } (r, c, e') \in L_2' \text{ for } r, c \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}\}$. The ordered pair (e, e') appears in P if and only if the ordered pair $(\sigma_E(e), \sigma_E(e'))$ appears in P'. As each pair $(e, e + n/2)$ appear twice in P (recalling that each symbol is taken modulo n), then each pair $(\sigma_E(e), \sigma_E(e + n/2)) = (\sigma_E(e), \sigma_E(e)+n/2)$ appear twice in P'. No pair (e, e) appears in P', or else $(\sigma_E^{-1}(e), \sigma_E^{-1}(e))$ would appear in P, which we know it does not. Each other possibility (e, e') clearly appears precisely once in P' because $(\sigma_E^{-1}(e), \sigma_E^{-1}(e'))$ appeared precisely once in P. Therefore the conditions are satisfied for L_1' and L_2' to be nearly orthogonal to each other, and so $\mathcal{L}'$ is a collection of μ $MNOLS$ of order n.

□

Permuting the rows in a collection of cyclic $MNOLS$ does not destroy the cyclic property:

Lemma 3.2. *Consider a collection of μ $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L}$, and permutation $\sigma_R \in \mathcal{S}_n$. If $\mathcal{L}$ is cyclic, then so is $\mathcal{L}(\sigma_R, I, I)$.*

Proof. Consider Latin squares $L \in \mathcal{L}$and $L' \in \mathcal{L}(\sigma_R, I, I)$ such that L' is the Latin square that is obtained by permuting the row indexes of L by σ. For every cell $(r, c, e) \in L'$, there must be a cell $(\sigma^{-1}(r), c, e) \in L$. As L is cyclic, $(\sigma^{-1}(r), c+1, e+1) \in L$, but this must mean that $(\sigma(\sigma^{-1}(r)), c+1, e+1) = (r, c+1, e+1) \in L'$. This implies $\mathcal{L}(\sigma_R, I, I)$ is cyclic. □

Simultaneously cycling the columns and symbols has no effect on a collection of cyclic $MNOLS$:

Lemma 3.3. *Consider a collection of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(I, \tau^i, \tau^i)$, for $0 \leq i < n$, recalling $\tau(x) = x+1 \mod n$ for $x \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$.*

Proof. Consider Latin squares $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and $L' \in \mathcal{L}(I, \tau^i, \tau^i)$ such that L' is obtained by permuting the column and symbol indexes of L by τ^i. As L is cyclic, for every cell $(r, c, e) \in L$, there must be a cell $(r, c-i, e-i) \in L$. But then $(r, \tau^i(c-i), \tau^i(e-i)) = (r, c, e) \in L'$. The result follows. □

If applying some permutation to the columns and to the symbols of a collection of $MNOLS$ does not remove the cyclic property, then the permutation applied must be of a certain form:

Lemma 3.4. *Consider a collection of μ $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L}$, and permutations $\sigma_C, \sigma_E \in \mathcal{S}_n$ such that $\sigma_E(y + n/2) \equiv \sigma_E(y) + n/2 \mod n$, for all $0 \leq y < n/2$. If both $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}(I, \sigma_C, \sigma_E)$ are cyclic, then $\sigma_C = m_x \cdot \tau^{\sigma_C(0)}$ and $\sigma_E = m_x \cdot \tau^{\sigma_E(0)}$, where $x = \sigma_E(1) - \sigma_E(0) = \sigma_C(1) - \sigma_C(0)$ and $gcd(x, n) = 1$.*

Proof. Take $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and $L' \in \mathcal{L}(I, \sigma_C, \sigma_E)$, so that $(r', c', e') \in L$ if and only if $(r', \sigma_C(c'), \sigma_E(e')) \in L'$. For each symbol i there is a row r with $(r, 0, i) \in L$, and because L is cyclic $(r, 1, i+1) \in L$. Then $(r, \sigma_C(0), \sigma_E(i)), (r, \sigma_C(1), \sigma_E(i+1)) \in L'$, and because L' is cyclic, $\sigma_E(i+1) - \sigma_E(i) = \sigma_C(1) - \sigma_C(0)$. Thus $\sigma_E(i+1) - \sigma_E(i)$ is independent of i and so set $\sigma_E(i+1) - \sigma_E(i) = x$. This gives $\sigma_E(1) - \sigma_E(0) = \sigma_C(1) - \sigma_C(0)$ when we take $i = 0$. This also gives $\sigma_E(i) = \sigma_E(0) + i \cdot x$, or equivalently $\sigma_E = m_x \cdot \tau^{\sigma_E(0)}$. Since σ_E is a permutation, we must have $gcd(x, n) = 1$.

For each column j there is a row r with $(r, j, 0) \in L$, and because L is cyclic $(r, j+1, 1) \in L$. Then $(r, \sigma_C(j), \sigma_E(0)), (r, \sigma_C(j+1), \sigma_E(1)) \in L'$, and because L' is cyclic, $\sigma_C(j+1) - \sigma_C(j) = \sigma_E(1) - \sigma_E(0) = x$ for all $0 \leq i < n$. This gives $\sigma_C(j) = \sigma_C(0) + j \cdot x$, or alternately $\sigma_C = m_x \cdot \tau^{\sigma_C(0)}$.

□

These facts come together to tell us exactly the form of any non-trivial group actions that preserve the cyclic property when applied to a list of $MNOLS$:

Lemma 3.5. *Consider collection of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{N}$. Then $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{L}(\sigma_R, \sigma_C, \sigma_E)$ if and only if there exists integers $0 \leq x, j' < n$ with $gcd(x, n) = 1$, such that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{L}(\sigma_R, m_x, m_x \cdot \tau^{j'})$.*

Proof. The reverse implication is clear, so we show the forward implication. Because $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{L}(\sigma_R, \sigma_C, \sigma_E)$ is cyclic, then $\mathcal{L}(I, \sigma_C, \sigma_E)$ is cyclic by Lemma 3.2, which by Lemma 3.4 implies $\sigma_C = m_x \cdot \tau^{\sigma_C(0)}$ and $\sigma_E = m_x \cdot \tau^{\sigma_E(0)}$ for some x with $gcd(x, n) = 1$. But then $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{L}(\sigma_R, m_x \cdot \tau^{\sigma_C(0)}, m_x \cdot \tau^{\sigma_E(0)}) = \mathcal{L}(\sigma_R, m_x, m_x \cdot \tau^{\sigma_E(0)-\sigma_C(0)})$ by Lemma 3.3 with $i = -\sigma_C(0)$. Taking $j' = \sigma_E(0) - \sigma_C(0)$ yields the result. □

This aligns with previous work of Li and van Rees [9] on isomorphisms of $(t, 2m)$-difference sets, which are equivalent to set-isotopisms of t $MNOLS$ of order $2m$.

4. Group actions

Let C_n^μ be the set of all lists of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n. From the previous section, not every action of $\mathcal{S}_n^3$ applied to an element of C_n^μ yields an element of C_n^μ. In fact, Lemma 3.5 informs us of the exact actions that can be used. Given a list of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L} = (L_1, \ldots, L_\mu)$, define the actions $\overline{m}_x(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{L}(I, m_x, m_x)$, $\overline{\tau}(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{L}(I, I, \tau)$, and $r_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{L}(\sigma, I, I)$, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$, $1 \leq x \leq n-1$, and $gcd(x, n) = 1$. Then the actions of $\mathcal{S}_n^3$ that map lists of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n to lists of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n are those that can be decomposed into an action $\overline{m}_x \cdot \overline{\tau}^j \cdot r_\sigma$, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$, $1 \leq j, x \leq n$, and $gcd(x, n) = 1$.

Given a list of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L} = (L_1, \ldots, L_\mu)$, we define the actions $s_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) = (L_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, L_{\sigma(\mu)})$, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_\mu$. The orbit of these actions on $\mathcal{L}$ contains as its elements exactly those lists of μ $MNOLS$ of order n that become the set $\{L_1, \ldots, L_\mu\}$ when we forget the ordering on the list.

Define $M = \{\overline{m}_x \mid 1 \leq x \leq n-1 \text{ and } gcd(x, n) = 1\}$, $T = \{\tau^i \mid 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}$, $R = \{r_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n\}$, and $S = \{s_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_\mu\}$, each of which form a group under composition.

We have previously defined a reduced list of μ $MNOLS$ of order n, but we are yet to define a reduced set of μ $MNOLS$ of order n. Take $\mathcal{L}$ to be a list of μ $MNOLS$ of order n. Notice that the least element under $\lhd$ in the orbit $R \cdot \mathcal{L}$ is a reduced list of μ $MNOLS$ of order n. We call the least element, say $(L_1, \ldots, L_\mu)$, under $\lhd$ in the orbit $\langle R, S \rangle \cdot \mathcal{L}$ *set-reduced*, and further we call the set $\{L_1, \ldots, L_\mu\}$ *reduced*.

We consider the actions of the group $\langle M, T, R, S \rangle$ on $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu$, which has order $\phi(n) \cdot n \cdot n! \cdot \mu!$. The orbits of this action are the *set-isotopy* classes of $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu$, and two lists in the same set-isotopy class are *set-isotopic*. The stabilizer $Is_s(\mathcal{L}) = \{\alpha \in \langle M, T, R, S \rangle \mid \alpha(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{L}\}$ is called the *set-autotopy* group, and each contained

element is called a *set-autotopy*. The number of distinct orbits under this group is the number of sets of μ $MNOLS$ of order n distinct up to isotopy.

We will also be interested in the subgroups $\langle M, T, R\rangle \leq \langle M, T, R, S\rangle$, $\langle R, S\rangle \leq \langle M, T, R, S\rangle$, $R \leq \langle M, T, R, S\rangle$, and $S \leq \langle M, T, R, S\rangle$. Their orbits are called, respectively, the list-isotopy classes, set-reduced classes, the list-reduced classes, and the set classes of $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu$. We call the stabilizers of $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{C}_n^\mu$, respectively, $Is_l(\mathcal{L})$, $Red_s(\mathcal{L})$, $Red_l(\mathcal{L})$, and $Set(\mathcal{L})$. The number of distinct orbits under these subgroups are respectively the number of lists distinct up to isotopy, the number of reduced sets, the number of reduced lists, and the number of sets of μ $MNOLS$ of order n.

This paper will find for $n \leq 16$ and for each $2 \leq \mu \leq 5$:

1. the number of isotopy classes of sets of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n;
2. the number of isotopy classes of lists of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n;
3. the number of reduced sets of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n;
4. the number of reduced lists of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n;
5. the number of sets of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n;
6. the number of lists of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n;

The identity action is the only action in $\langle R\rangle$ and $\langle S\rangle$ that is a stabilizer, hence $|Red_l(\mathcal{L})| = 1$ and $|Set(\mathcal{L})| = 1$, the orbits of $\langle R\rangle$ have constant size $n!$, and the orbits of $\langle S\rangle$ have constant size $\mu!$. Each set-isotopy class can be divided into classes corresponding to the other subgroups, and is closed in the sense that two lists or sets that are equivalent under any of the equivalences must appear in the same set-isotopy class. Our primary approach for the computer search for this problem is to find a list of μ $MNOLS$ of order n that represents each set-isotopy classes, and count how many classes of each type appear within this set-isotopy class:

Lemma 4.1. *Given $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{C}_n^\mu$:*

1. *the number of list-isotopy classes within the set-isotopy class of $\mathcal{L}$ is:* $\mu! \cdot |Is_l(\mathcal{L})|/|Is_s(\mathcal{L})|$;
2. *the number of set-reduced classes within the set-isotopy class of $\mathcal{L}$ is:* $\phi(n) \cdot n \cdot |Red_s(\mathcal{L})|/|Is_s(\mathcal{L})|$;
3. *the number of list-reduced classes within the set-isotopy class of $\mathcal{L}$ is:* $\phi(n) \cdot n \cdot \mu! \cdot |Red_l(\mathcal{L})|/|Is_s(\mathcal{L})| = \phi(n) \cdot n \cdot \mu!/|Is_s(\mathcal{L})|$;
4. *the number of set classes within the set-isotopy class of $\mathcal{L}$ is:* $\phi(n) \cdot n \cdot n! \cdot |Set(\mathcal{L})|/|Is_s(\mathcal{L})| = \phi(n) \cdot n \cdot n!/|Is_s(\mathcal{L})|$; *and*
5. *the number of lists within the set-isotopy class of $\mathcal{L}$ is:* $\phi(n) \cdot n \cdot \mu! \cdot n!/|Is_s(\mathcal{L})|$.

Proof. By the orbit-stabilizer theorem. □

5. Canonical forms

Given a partition of $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu$ as $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu = \cup_{i=1}^{\alpha} C_i$ with $C_i \cap C_j = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq \alpha$, a *canonical form* is a function $f : \mathcal{C}_n^\mu \to \mathcal{C}_n^\mu$ such that for all $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{M} \in C_i$,

$f(\mathcal{L}) = f(\mathcal{M})$ and $f(\mathcal{L}) \in C_i$. We will say the lists within $Im(f)$ are *canonical*. We call $\mathcal{M} \in C_i$ with $\mathcal{M} = f(\mathcal{M})$ the *canonical representation* of C_i (each of these $\mathcal{M}$ are canonical). This allows us to represent each orbit of the elements of a group acting on $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu$ by a single list of μ $MNOLS$ of order n.

Typically, enumerations involving Latin squares [5][13] utilize a conversion from a Latin square to a labeled graph where an isotopism applied to the Latin square corresponds to a certain relabeling of the vertices of the graph. Programs such as nauty [11] can be used to find a canonical labelling of a graph, and by comparing the canonical labeling of two graphs that correspond to two Latin squares, it is easy to evaluate whether the two Latin squares are isotopic or not. Such programs are useful because they are the fastest implemented solutions for the graph isomorphism problem, which is in NP, and hence also for determining when two Latin squares are isotopic or not.

During initial investigations it was found that the greatest portion of time taken by our enumeration programs was spent calculating which pairs of Latin squares were nearly orthogonal. Of these pairs of Latin squares, only a small portion were nearly orthogonal and would then go on to be checked for isotopisms, so isotopism checking occurred relatively infrequent compared to checking for nearly orthogonality. This is atypical for Latin square based enumeration problems, as it is common that the greatest amount of time is spent on isotopism checking. So while external software to find canonical representations of classes of $MNOLS$ may very well speed up our program, this speed up will be negligible. Due to this, we have opted to use an explicit canonical form that is easy to explain.

We will use a canonical form with the property that removing the last Latin square of any list of μ $MNOLS$ of order n that is canonical yields a list of $\mu - 1$ MNOLS of order n that is canonical. Then, as will be in two of our three algorithms, our approach is to use all lists of $\mu - 1$ $MNOLS$ of order n that are canonical, and extend these to lists of μ $MNOLS$ of order n that are canonical. We also wish to have some knowledge about which Latin squares we can append in order to avoid, as much as possible, creating a list of μ $MNOLS$ of order n that are not canonical.

Let $\mathcal{M}_i \in C_i$ be such that $\mathcal{M}_i \lhd \mathcal{L}$ for each $\mathcal{L} \in C_i$. In this paper we will consider the canonical form f defined by $f(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{M}_i$, for $\mathcal{L} \in C_i$. For example if we take C_i to be the orbits of $\langle R \rangle$, the canonical representation of each orbit is the unique list of μ $MNOLS$ of order n amongst the orbit that is reduced.

This aligns with our previous definition of reduced lists of μ $MNOLS$ of order n, so rather that saying such a list is canonical, we will now say it is *list-reduced*. If instead we take C_i to be the orbits of $\langle R, S \rangle$, we call the canonical representation of each orbit *set-reduced*. Similarly we say a list is *set-canonical* if we take the partition of C_n^μ into set-isotopy classes, and *list-canonical* if we take the partition of C_n^μ into list-isotopy classes.

Lemma 5.1. *Given the partition of $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu$ into set-isotopy classes and f a canonical form:*

1. *The number of set-isotopy classes in $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu$ is $|Im(f)|$.*

2. *The number of list-isotopy classes in* $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu$ *is* $\sum_{\mathcal{L}\in Im(f)} \mu! \cdot |Is_l(\mathcal{L})|/|Is_s(\mathcal{L})|$.
3. *The number of set-reduced classes in* $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu$ *is* $\sum_{\mathcal{L}\in Im(f)} \phi(n) \cdot n \cdot \frac{|Red_s(\mathcal{L})|}{|Is_s(\mathcal{L})|}$.
4. *The number of list-reduced classes in* $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu$ *is* $LR = \sum_{\mathcal{L}\in Im(f)} \phi(n) \cdot n \cdot \mu!/|Is_s(\mathcal{L})|$.
5. *The number of set classes in* $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu$ *is* $\sum_{\mathcal{L}\in Im(f)} \phi(n) \cdot n \cdot n!/|Is_s(\mathcal{L})| = LR \cdot \frac{n!}{\mu!}$.
6. *The number of lists in* $\mathcal{C}_n^\mu$ *is* $\sum_{\mathcal{L}\in Im(f)} \phi(n) \cdot n \cdot \mu! \cdot n!/|Is_s(\mathcal{L})| = LR \cdot n!$.

Proof. A consequence of Lemma 4.1. □

6. Algorithm

There has been a history of errors in the enumeration of Latin squares (this history is described in [14]). As such, it has become standard practice in the enumeration of Latin squares and related structures to run at least two distinct programs to enumerate using two different methods, and check the results are identical. We present 3 different algorithms that when implemented independently by two authors arrived at the same results for $\mu \geq 2$ and $n \leq 14$. One of these algorithms when implemented by one author found a result for $\mu \geq 2$ and $n = 16$.

Any cyclic Latin square can be generated by its first column. As such, we look for lists of μ columns of size n that can generate lists of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n.

Algorithm A constructs all list-reduced lists of $\overline{\mu}$ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n. Algorithm B and Algorithm C will only construct the set-canonical representations of each set-isotopy class, with the difference being that Algorithm B uses a basic depth first search, while Algorithm C saves information of those cyclic Latin squares that may be used, and uses that to reduce repeated calculations.

Algorithm A works by using the canonical representation of a list-reduced class of $(\overline{\mu} - 1)$ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n, and adding possible cyclic Latin squares in order to yield lists of $\overline{\mu}$ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n that are list-reduced, where $2 \leq \overline{\mu} \leq \mu$. In the case the result is set-canonical, we calculate $|Red_s(\mathcal{L})|$, $|Is_l(\mathcal{L})|$, and $|Is_s(\mathcal{L})|$. Whether or not the result was set-canonical, we continue to add more cyclic Latin squares recursively. After completion, we merge the results and use Lemma 5.1 to find the total number of classes.

Algorithm B works by using the set-canonical representation of a set-isotopy class of $(\overline{\mu} - 1)$ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n, and adding possible cyclic Latin squares in order to yield lists of $\overline{\mu}$ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n before checking whether the resulting lists are set-canonical, where $2 \leq \overline{\mu} \leq \mu$. If a result, say $\mathcal{L}$, is set-canonical, it is the canonical representation of a set-isotopy class of $\overline{\mu}$ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n. In such a case, we calculate $|Red_s(\mathcal{L})|$, $|Is_l(\mathcal{L})|$, and $|Is_s(\mathcal{L})|$, before continuing to add more cyclic Latin squares recursively. After completion, we merge the results and use Lemma 5.1 to find the total number of classes.

Algorithm C begins by generating all columns that could be used to generate the second Latin square in a list of list-reduced two $MNOLS$ of order n (See

Algorithm 1: Algorithm A

input : An integer $\overline{\mu}$ with $\overline{\mu} < \mu$;
A list of $\overline{\mu}$ columns $(C_1, \ldots, C_{\overline{\mu}})$ that generate a list of $\overline{\mu}$ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n that is list-reduced;

output: The quadruple of integers ((1),(2),(3),(4)), a count of the number of lists of μ columns $(C_1, \ldots, C_{\overline{\mu}}, D_{\overline{\mu}+1}, \ldots, D_\mu)$ that generate lists of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n that are (1) list-reduced, (2) set-reduced, (3) list-canonical, and (4) set-canonical;

```
1  sum ← (0, 0, 0, 0);
2  function extend1(μ̄, C_1, ..., C_μ̄)
3  for columns P that form a permutation do
4      for i = 1 : μ̄ do
5          if The pair of columns (C_i, P) does not generate two cyclic
           MNOLS of order n then
6              go to the next possible column.
7      L ← the list of μ cyclic MNOLS of order n generated by
       (C_1, ..., C_μ, P)
8      if μ̄ = μ − 1 then
9          if L is set-canonical then
10             sum ← sum + (1, 1, 1, 1)
11         else
12             if L is list-canonical then
13                 sum ← sum + (1, 1, 1, 0)
14             else
15                 if L is set-reduced then
16                     sum ← sum + (1, 1, 0, 0)
17                 else
18                     sum ← sum + (1, 0, 0, 0)
19     else
20         sum ← sum + extend1(μ̄ + 1, C_1, ..., C_μ̄, P);
21 return sum;
```

Algorithm 2: Algorithm B

input : An integer $\overline{\mu}$ with $\overline{\mu} < \mu$;
A list of $\overline{\mu}$ columns $(C_1, \ldots, C_{\overline{\mu}})$ that generate a list of cyclic $\overline{\mu}$ $MNOLS$ of order n that is set-canonical;

output: A multiset of ordered triples, *store*, that for each set-isotopy class of μ $MNOLS$ of order n with canonical representative $\mathcal{L}$ that can be generated from $(C_1, \ldots, C_{\overline{\mu}}, D_{\overline{\mu}+1}, \ldots, D_\mu)$, *store* contains one triple $(Is_s(\mathcal{L}), Is_l(\mathcal{L}), Red_s(\mathcal{L}))$;

```
1  store ← ∅;
2  procedure extend2(μ̄, C_1, ..., C_μ̄)
3  for columns P that form a permutation do
4      for i = 1 : μ̄ do
5          if The pair of columns (C_i, P) does not generate a list of two
           cyclic MNOLS of order n then
6              break, and go to the next possible column P.
7      L ← the list of μ̄ + 1 cyclic MNOLS of order n generated by
       (C_1, ..., C_μ̄, P)
8      if L is set-canonical then
9          if μ̄ = μ − 1 then
10             store ← store ∪ {(Is_s(L), Is_l(L), Red_s(L))}
11         else
12             store ← store ∪ extend(μ̄ + 1, C_1, ..., C_μ̄, P)
13 return store
```

Algorithm A). It then places those columns that form set-canonical $MNOLS$ in $list1$, those that do not have 1 as their first entry in $list2$, and throwing away those that have 1 as their first entry but do not form set-canonical $MNOLS$. For each $A \in list1$, create a list $list3$ that contains each $B \in list2$ such that (A, B) generates a list of two cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n. Construct a graph with vertices in $list3$, and edges connecting points B_1 and B_2 if (B_1, B_2) generates a list of two cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n. Then each clique $(e_1, \ldots, e_\alpha)$ corresponds to $(\alpha + 2)$ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n, generated by $(I, A, e_1, \ldots, e_\alpha)$. For each clique, if the generated $(\alpha + 2)$ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L}$, is set-canonical, we calculate $|Red_s(\mathcal{L})|$, $|Is_l(\mathcal{L})|$, and $|Is_s(\mathcal{L})|$. After completion, we merge the results and use Lemma 5.1 to find the total number of classes.

Finding cliques is usually a hard problem. This is not an issue for our calculations as the clique size of our problem turns out to be very small. In fact, no cliques of size three existed in our graph, and the computation time to prove this was negligible within our program as a whole.

7. Results and conclusions

The counts that were found appear in Tables 2,3,4, and 5. Comparing these results to the previously known cases in Table 1, we see that the new values of particular significance are when $\mu = 3$ and $n \in \{10, 12, 14, 16\}$, when $\mu = 4$ and $n \in \{12, 14, 16\}$, and when $\mu = 5$ and $n \in \{14, 16\}$. The results when $\mu = 5$ disproves Conjecture 5.2 of [9] that proposed the maximum μ for which a set of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n exists is $\lceil n/4 \rceil + 1$, as there does not exist five $MNOLS$ of order 14 and five $MNOLS$ of order 16 as predicted by the conjecture.

For $n = 14$, the search using Algorithm A consumed 372.7 days of CPU time, using Algorithm B consumed 19.695 hours of CPU time, and using Algorithm C consumed 3.956 hours of CPU time. Algorithm C consumes a great deal more memory than the other methods. We ran Algorithm C for $n = 16$, which consumed 154.05 days of CPU time and over 7GBs of RAM was required. This method therefore would have to be significantly modified to reduce the memory usage if an attempt was made for running it with parameters $n = 18$.

We say a list of μ $MNOLS$ of order n is of type *type 0* if it is isotopically equivalent to a list of reduced μ $MNOLS$ of order n, $\mathcal{L} = (L_1, \ldots, L_\mu)$, with $(0, 0, 1), (1, 0, 0) \in L_2$, and is of *type 1* otherwise. A set of μ $MNOLS$ of order n is of type 0 if fixing the order in some way gives a list of μ $MNOLS$ of order n of type 0, and is of type 1 otherwise.

A collection of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n contains a *row-intercalate* of difference d if two of its Latin squares L and M have two rows r, r' with $r < r'$ and $r' - r = d$ such that $(r, 0, e) \in L$ if and only if $(r', 0, e) \in M$, and also $(r', 0, e') \in L$ if and only if $(r, 0, e') \in M$, for some $e, e' \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. Then it is clear that a collection of μ $MNOLS$ of order n is of type 0 if and only if it contains a row-intercalate of difference d and $gcd(d, n) = 1$. Clearly set-isotopy preserves type. In Tables 9, 10, and 11 we show the number of set-isotopy classes of each type. Observe that the proportion of set-isotopy classes

Algorithm 3: Algorithm C

input : 1/ A list, $list1$, that contains all lists of columns such that $C \in list1$ implies the pair of columns (I, C) generates a list of two cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n that is set-canonical;
2/ A list, $list2$, that contains all lists of columns such that $C \in list2$ implies the pair of columns (I, C) generates a list of two cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n that is list-reduced and C does not contain 1 as its first element;

output: A multiset of ordered triples, *store*, that for each set-isotopy class of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n with canonical representative $\mathcal{L}$, *store* contains one triple $(Is_s(\mathcal{L}), Is_l(\mathcal{L}), Red_s(\mathcal{L}))$;

1 $store \leftarrow \emptyset$;
2 $vert(graph) \leftarrow \emptyset$;
3 $edge(graph) \leftarrow \emptyset$;
4 **for** $C_1 \in list1$ **do**
5 $list3 \leftarrow \emptyset$
6 **for** $C_2 \in list2$ **do**
7 **if** (C_1, C_2) *generates a list of two cyclic* $MNOLS$ *of order* n **then**
8 $list3 \leftarrow list3 \cup C_2$
9 $vert(graph) \leftarrow list3$
10 **for** $C_3 \in list3$ **do**
11 **for** $C_4 \in list3$ **do**
12 **if** (C_3, C_4) *generates a list of two cyclic* $MNOLS$ *of order* n **then**
13 $edge(graph) \leftarrow edge(graph) \cup \{C_3, C_4\}$
14 **for** *all cliques* $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{\mu-2})$ *of size* $\mu - 2$ *such that for each* $\overline{\mu}$ *with* $\overline{\mu} \leq \mu$ *the list of* $\overline{\mu}$ $MNOLS$ *generated by* $(I, C_1, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{\overline{\mu}-2})$ *is set-canonical* **do**
15 $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow$ the list of μ cyclic $MNOLS$ of order n generated by $(I, C_1, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{\mu-2})$
16 $store \leftarrow store \cup \{(Is_s(\mathcal{L}), Is_l(\mathcal{L}), Red_s(\mathcal{L}))\}$

n	4	6	8	10	12	14	16
set-isotopy	1	2	9	68	1140	19040	489296
set-reduced	2	12	136	2340	52608	1589056	62516224
list-isotopy	1	3	12	128	2224	38000	977696
list-reduced	4	24	256	4640	105216	3178112	125026304

Table 2: The number of two $MNOLS$ of order n under the given equivalence.

n	4	6	8	10	12	14	16
set-isotopy	0	1	1	73	4398	429111	70608753
set-reduced	0	6	16	2920	211104	36031716	9037728896
list-isotopy	0	2	6	438	26388	2574306	423652518
list-reduced	0	12	96	17520	1266624	216190296	54226373376

Table 3: The number of three $MNOLS$ of order n under the given equivalence.

n	4	6	8	10	12	14	16
set-isotopy	0	0	0	1	2	117	14672
set-reduced	0	0	0	20	96	8638	1870592
list-isotopy	0	0	0	12	48	2484	350730
list-reduced	0	0	0	480	2304	207312	44879616

Table 4: The number of four $MNOLS$ of order n under the given equivalence.

n	4	6	8	10	12	14	16
set-isotopy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 5: The number of five $MNOLS$ of order n under the given equivalence.

that are of type 0 increases as μ increases. This may be of interest in future searches for sets of μ $MNOLS$ of order n where μ is relatively large. Considering each type individually may allow more efficient construction of those set-isotopy classes with non-trivial set-autotopy group , as each set-autotopy must map row-intercalates to row-intercalates. Note that $|red_s(\mathcal{L})| = 1$ for $n = 14$, so we omit the column for $|red_s(\mathcal{L})|$ in this case.

$\lvert Is_s(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	$\lvert Is_l(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	#Type 0	#Type 1	#Total
1	1	3618	15186	18804
2	1	0	80	80
2	2	46	88	134
3	3	2	14	16
6	6	1	5	6
	total:	3667	15373	19040

Table 6: The two $MNOLS$ of order 14, by their type and autotopy group sizes.

$\lvert Is_s(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	$\lvert Is_l(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	#Type 0	#Type 1	#Total
1	1	202382	226436	428818
2	2	146	57	203
3	1	24	63	87
6	2	1	2	3
	total:	202553	226558	429111

Table 7: The three $MNOLS$ of order 14, by their type and autotopy group sizes.

$\lvert Is_s(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	$\lvert Is_l(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	#Type 0	#Type 1	#Total
1	1	67	26	93
2	1	3	8	11
2	2	1	0	1
3	1	4	7	11
6	2	1	0	1
	total:	76	41	117

Table 8: The four $MNOLS$ of order 14, by their type and autotopy group sizes.

$\lvert Is_s(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	$\lvert Is_l(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	$\lvert red_s(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	#Type 0	#Type 1	#Total
1	1	1	106794	380686	487480
2	1	1	12	822	834
2	2	1	260	660	920
4	2	1	0	12	12
2	1	2	46	0	46
4	2	2	4	0	4
		total:	107116	382180	489296

Table 9: The two $MNOLS$ of order 16, by their type and autotopy group sizes.

$\lvert Is_s(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	$\lvert Is_l(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	$\lvert red_s(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	#Type 0	#Type 1	#Total
1	1	1	36845488	33760273	70605761
2	2	1	2326	666	2992
		total:	36847814	33760939	70608753

Table 10: The three $MNOLS$ of order 16, by their type and autotopy group sizes.

$\lvert Is_s(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	$\lvert Is_l(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	$\lvert red_s(\mathcal{L})\rvert$	#Type 0	#Type 1	#Total
1	1	1	11146	3401	14547
2	1	1	28	79	107
2	2	1	7	2	9
2	1	2	8	0	8
4	1	4	1	0	1
		total:	11190	3482	14672

Table 11: The four $MNOLS$ of order 16, by their type and autotopy group sizes.

References

References

[1] F. Demirkale, D.M. Donovan, J.L. Hall, A. Khodkar, and A. Rao. Difference covering arrays and pseudo-orthogonal latin squares. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 2015. doi: 10.1007/s00373-015-1649-8.

[2] F. Demirkale, D.M. Donovan, and A. Khodkar. Direct constructions for general families of cyclic mutually nearly orthogonal latin squares. *J. Combin. Des.*, 23(5):195203, 2015.

[3] J. Egan and I.A. Wanless. Enumeration of mols of small order. *arXiv:1406.3681v2*, 2014.

[4] I.A. Faradžev. Generation of nonisomorphic graphs with a given distribution of the degrees of vertices. (russian). *Algorithmic studies in combinatorics (Russian)*, 185:11–19, 1978.

[5] A. Hulpke, P. Kaski, and P.R.J. Östergård. The number of latin squares of order 11. *Math. Comp.*, 80(274):1197–1219, 2011.

[6] P. Kaski and P.R.J. Östergård. *Classification algorithms for codes and designs*. Classification Algorithms for Codes and Designs, Springer, 2006.

[7] G. Kolesova, C.W.H. Lam, and L. Thiel. On the number of 8×8 latin squares. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 54(1):143–148, 1990.

[8] C. Laywine and G. Mullen. *Discrete mathematics using latin squares*. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization, 1998.

[9] P.C. Li and G.H.J van Rees. Nearly orthogonal latin squares. *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.*, 62:1324, 2007.

[10] B.D. McKay. Isomorph-free exhaustive generation. *J. Algorithms*, 26(2): 306–324, 1998.

[11] B.D. McKay and A. Piperno. Practical graph isomorphism, II. *J. Symbolic Computation*, 60:94–112, 2013. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2013.09.003.

[12] B.D. McKay and I.M. Wanless. Most latin squares have many subsquares. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 86(2):322–347, 1999.

[13] B.D. McKay and I.M. Wanless. On the number of latin squares. *Ann. Comb.*, 9(3):335–344, 2005.

[14] B.D. McKay, A. Meynert, and W.J. Myrvold. Small latin squares, quasigroups and loops. *J. Combin. Des.*, 15(2):98119, 2007.

[15] E.B. Pasles and D. Raghavarao. Mutually nearly orthogonal latin squares of order 6. *Util. Math.*, 65:6572, 2004.

[16] D. Raghavarao, S.S. Shrikhande, and M.S. Shrikhande. Incidence matrices and inequalities for combinatorial designs. *Journal of Combinatorial Designs*, 10(1):1726, 2002.

[17] R.C. Read. Every one a winner or how to avoid isomorphism search when cataloguing combinatorial configurations. *Algorithmic aspects of combinatorics (Conf., Vancouver Island, B.C., 1976). Ann. Discrete Math.*, 2: 107–120, 1978.

[18] G.H.J. van Rees. Private communication. October 2015.